

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

G. M. 177-17 & 16.12.14.
G. M. 302-15 & 12-14-15-18-20
21 1917.

File No. 491-17

Serial Nos. 1 to 3-

(Gen. Insi.)

Later references.

G. M. 177-17 & 15 & 16.

P-12

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 3*

Part B for February 1918.

SUBJECT.

Brings to the notice of Government the
conduct of Dr. Venkatasubbiah Asst. to
the Dr. of Arch. Researches.

L.S. To Doctor A. Venkatasubbiah. Asst. to
the Dr. of Arch. Researches

No. G 11713 of 23-2-1918

States that the Govt. are not pleased
with the relation that exists between
the two officers & hopes that he will
maintain more harmonious re-
lations with the Head of his Dept.

Prinamula
2-3-18

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No.

491

of 191 7-

Serial
No.

From

/

The Director of Archaeological Researches

Bangalore.

/ Requests the immediate transfer of Dr. Venkata-Subbiah (his Office Assistant) for reasons mentioned in the letter.

2 Mr. R. Narasimhachar, Director of Archaeological Researches contributed two articles to the Indian Antiquary about the identity of Vidyanaraya who was a Swami of the Sringeri Mutt in the fourteenth century. The questions discussed are whether he was a warrior and a minister, whether he was really the author of the various books and commentaries attributed to him, to what Gotram he belonged² and so on.

3 Mr. Narasimhachar's theory was controverted by Mr. V. Subramanya Aiyar in an article contributed by him to the Journal of the Mythic Society (Pages 217 to 224 of Vol: VII)

4 This was in its turn criticized by Mr. Narasimhachar in an article published in the same volume of the said journal (Vide pages 318 to 320)

5 Dr. Venkatasubbia has now written an article in the same Journal criticizing the views of Mr. Narasimhachar. His main position is that the authorities relied upon by Mr. Narasimha Char. are unreliable (See the last para at page 130, Vol: VIII)

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No.

of 191

Serial
No.

and he has said in some places that Mr. Narasimhachar is wrong or has made mistaken statements.

6 Having entered the arena Mr. Narasimhachar should be prepared for criticism. On this subject of historical importance, which has also a tinge of sectarianism, there is a considerable amount of controversy. Opinions cannot possibly be unanimous. If it is open to the public to criticize Mr. Narasimachar's articles in the Antiquary, it is difficult to see why Dr. Venkatasubbiah as a member of the public - should not give expression to his views. The article was contributed by Mr. Narasimhachar not in his capacity as Director of Archaeological Researches, Mysore nor was the criticism of Dr. Venkatasubbiah made by him as Assistant to the Director. Public interests do not demand that independence of thought on the part of officials on non-political or non-official matters should be curbed.

Chief Secretary)

U J 18/1/18

7 I think the above view is all right. There would be no question in the matter if both Mr N. & Dr V were not in the Archaeological Dept, the business of which is to investigate questions of the kind now in controversy. To put a parallel case, suppose the Chief Judge of the Chief Court had

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No.

of 191 .

Serial
No.

written ^{an} article in a law journal dealing with some question of law, would it be proper or not for a Munsiff, say, to criticise the views advanced in such an article. I think the answer would be in the affirmative. It would no doubt be quite a different matter, if the legal opinions had been expressed by the Chief Judge in the course of a judgment, & the Munsiff ventured to criticise those views & question their authority in the course of another judgment.

8 ~~This analogy goes~~ A munsiff is bound to follow ruling laid down by higher courts, ^{& obey authority as authority} but I am not sure that in scientific matters official subordination or discipline extends to the unquestioning acceptance of the opinions of superior officers.

9 To take another analogy, if the Director of Geology holds a particular opinion about a question in geology, would it not be open to an Assistant Geologist to hold another opinion & advance such an opinion, even in an official report? I should certainly answer yes.

10 No doubt, in such cases, criticism

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No.

of 191

Serial
No.

& the expression of differences of opinion
ought to be more guarded & lie ~~more~~ ^{more}
within the limits of courtesy & ~~gentlemanliness~~
gentlemanliness, than if there were
no official relations between the critic
& the criticised.

11 I have read through Dr V's article &
marked on p 122, 126 & 127 some passages
which refer to Mr N by name. I do not
think these ~~are~~ are open to any serious
objection on the ground of fair comment.

12 I fear Mr N is super sensitive
to criticism ~~the~~ entertains incorrect
notions of official etiquette & discipline
in matters of this kind.

See order passed
4

- 188 members
- 13 (What happened the previous 19/1/18
quarterly?)
- 14 It looks as if I became a member of the
Committee expected from the other 2
gentlemen.
- 15 — the committee of head office which
on such matters in such departments
of inquiry as to be held by the committee
may lead to a certain difference
but they need not be the cause
- CHJ
19/1/18
19/1/18

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

any letter personal
Cuthbert

16 The language used
by Mr. Vulliamy in
some places - being as
inadequate to his hand
but his youth & inexperience
& his policy the treatment
he receives are some that
are responsible

17 Let's can hardly
take any notice of these
articles unless becoming
suggested.

18 At the same time it
is not at all a pleasing
right loss & gives of
me Dept - being under the
an article of public opinion
in magazines & holding
there are. A certain decision
is necessary in carrying on
public opinion - to
limitless language -
should be used in
pointing out differences
even errors. This rule
Mr V. Subish has broken
because he advised copy
which is a position which

i mainly are the
three he holds in
he over it is not
to see that it is
definitely maintained.

19 00. The issue to both

in the copy the above
remarks this form.

20 11/11/20
W.D. 94-GPB-60,200-23-7-15
Mr V. Subish has broken
because he advised copy
which is a position which

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No.

of 191

Serial
No.

22 Ins Drafts are put up
(Chun/Secy) 22/23/18

23 Please retype drafts as revised

23/24/18
24/25/18

24 Re-typed drafts submitted
(Chun/Secy) 24/25/18

25 Drafts maybe approved.

26 1st members

26/27/18
27/28/18

27 May Issue

Duway

27/28/18

28 May issue

19.2.18

29 Issue

29/30/18

2 To. The Director 9.11.714 9.23.2.18

states that the matters in depths like Arch¹⁹⁴ may lead to differences of opinion & that therefore they may not lead to any personal controversy. & hope that in future harmonious relations may prevail.

2705
5/2/18

652(a)
7/4/18

by

28 To. The Asst. to the Director
9.11.715 9.23.2.18
states that the present situation
is not pleasing to Govt. & that
more harmonious relations
may prevail in future.

7 TE

5417 7

Sm 491-17
31

CONFIDENTIAL.

D.O. No. 98

W.T. Please put up the copy of the Journal referred to.

18/1/18

Office of the Director of
Archaeological Researches in Mysore,
BANGALORE, 15th JANUARY 1918.

Dear Mr. Balasundaram Iyer,

I have to draw the attention of Government to an article in the January Number (Vol. VIII No. 2, pp. 118-136) of the Journal of the Mythic Society, in which my Assistant Dr. Venkatasubabaiya has thought it fit, in defiance of all official etiquette, to hold me up to ridicule by pointing out "mistakes" in my Annual Archaeological Reports and other contributions. Such conduct on the part of a subordinate of the Department is simply unthinkable and is subversive of all official discipline and etiquette. I have not come across such a thing anywhere else in India. I can of course send a reply defending myself and showing the hollowness of his arguments, but do not want to do so as it cannot but be unseemly for an officer to engage himself in a controversy with his subordinate in a public Journal. Even supposing, for argument's sake, that there was

Confidential

8 13

No. 9. 11714

Gm 491-17-14

Date 28.2.18

To

Praktanavimarsa Vichakshana

Rao Bahadur R. Narasimhachar, Esq., M.A.,

Director of Archaeological Researches

In Mysore, Bangalore.

Dear Sir,

Government have perused your D. O. letter No. 98 of the 15th January 1918 bringing to their notice the conduct of Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah, your Assistant, in contributing to the Journal of the Mythic Society the article referred to by you.

I am to observe that discussions of academic interest on such matters in technical departments as Archaeology, etc., may lead to acute differences of opinion, but they need not be the cause of any bitter - personal controversy.

Exception may perhaps be taken to the language used in some places by Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah, but ^{presumably} ~~perhaps~~ his youth and inexperience are somewhat responsible therefor.

In the circumstances, Government can hardly take notice of the article in question in the manner suggested by you, but they hope that in future more harmonious relations will exist between you and your Assistant.

I am to request that the accompanying letter may kindly be forwarded to Dr. Venkatasubbiah.

Yours sincerely,

em

28/2/18

WJ

13 29/1/18

28/12

Confl
No 9 11715
To
491-17-~~45~~

9 14
3

Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah, dated 23.2.19

Assistant to the Director of
Archaeological Researches
in Mysore.

THROUGH

The Director of Archaeological
Researches in Mysore.

Dear Sir,

Mr. R. Narasimhachar, Director of Archaeological Researches in Mysore, has brought to the notice of Government an article of yours published in the Journal of the Mythic Society for January 1918 commenting on certain contributions made by him to the Indian Antiquary. Government have perused the article and are of opinion that it is not at all a pleasing sight to see two Officers of one Department entering the arena of public discussion in magazines and trying to hold their own. Discussions of academic interest on such matters may lead to acute differences of opinion but they ~~need~~ ^{should} not result in any bitter personal controversy. A certain decorum is necessary in carrying on public discussions and temperate language should be used in pointing out differences and even errors.

Government are constrained to

observe that in the article in question this wholesome rule has been broken by you. Exception may be taken to the language used in certain places, but Government are willing to attribute ^{this} ~~them~~ to youth and inexperience rather than to an intention to give offence.

You occupy a position which is - mainly due to the Office you hold and you owe it to Government to see that its dignity is maintained. I am to express the hope that in future you - will maintain more harmonious relations with the Head of your Office and conduct yourself so as to give no reasonable -- cause for complaint.

Yours sincerely,

W. J. P.
4/12/12